Published Monthly. Volume 133. Number 4.

SIXTY-SEVENTH YEAR.

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

EDITED BY ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

October, 1881.

NEW YORK:
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY.

LONDON: SAMPSON LOW, MARSTON, SEARLE & RIVINGTON. PARIS: THE GALIGNANI LIBRARY.
BERLIN: A. ASHER & CO. GENEVA: J. CHERBULIEZ. ROME: LOESCHER & CO.
MELBOURNE: W. ROBERTSON. YOKOHAMA AND SHANGHAI: KELLY & WALSH.

TERMS.—Five Dollars a year. Single number, Fifty Cents.

Entered at the Post-Office at New York, and admitted for transmission through the mails as second-class matter.

Volume 132 of the North American Review.

NOW READY, COMPLETE.

CONTENTS.

JANUARY.

The Philosophy of Persecution. Professor JOHN FISKE
Controlling Forces in American Politics. Senator G. F. EDMUNDS.
Atheism in Colleges. President JOHN BASCOM.
The Ruins of Central America. Part V. DÉSIRÉ CHARNAY.
Partisan Government. WM. D. LE SUEUR.
Popular Art Education. Professor JOHN F. WEIR.
The Limitations of Sex. NINA MORAIS.
The Mission of the Democratic Party. Senator W. A. WALLACE.
Recent Philological Works. Professor F. A. MARCH.

FEBRUARY.

The Nicaragua Canal. General U. S. GRANT.
The Pulpit and the Pew. OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES.
Aaron's Rod in Politics. Judge ALBION W. TOURGEE.
Did Shakespeare Write Bacon's Works? JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.
Partisanship in the Supreme Court. Senator JOHN T. MORGAN.
The Ruins of Central America. Part VI. DÉSIRÉ CHARNAY.
The Poetry of the Future. WALT WHITMAN.

MARCH.

Theology in the Public Schools. Bishop A. C. COXE.
The Isthmian Ship-Railway. JAMES B. EADS.
The Effects of Negro Suffrage. Chief-Justice H. H. CHALMERS.
The Success of the Free-School System. JOHN D. PHILBRICK.
Despotism in Lunatic Asylums. DORMAN B. EATON.
The Political Attitude of the Mormons. Judge C. C. GOODWIN.
Theological Charlatanism. JOHN FISKE.
Recent Publications in Physics. Prof. A. W. WRIGHT.

APRIL.

Reform *versus* Reformation. Judge ALBION W. TOURGEE.
The Thing that Might be. MARK PATTISON.
Religion in Schools. Bishop B. J. MCQUAID.
The Ownership of Railroad Property. GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS.
The Historic Genesis of Protestantism. JOHN FISKE.
The Telegraph Monopoly. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER.
Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. ANTHONY TROLLOPE.

MAY.

Centralization in the Federal Government. DAVID DUDLEY FIELD.
The Old Version and the New. Rev. Dr. PHILIP SCHAFF.
The Needs of the Supreme Court. WILLIAM STRONG.
Utah and Its People. GEORGE Q. CANNON.
Shall Americans Build Ships? JOHN ROACH.
The Life-Saving Service. S. S. COX.
The Ruins of Central America. Part VII. DÉSIRÉ CHARNAY.
What Morality Have We Left? A NEW-LIGHT MORALIST.

JUNE.

Our Future Fiscal Policy. HUGH MCCULLOCH.
The Patrician Element in American Society. GEORGE B. LORING.
A New Phase of the Reform Movement. DORMAN B. EATON.
Shall Americans Own Ships? Prof. W. G. SUMNER.
The Color Line. FREDERICK DOUGLASS.
The Ruins of Central America. Part VIII. DÉSIRÉ CHARNAY.
Vaccination. Dr. AUSTIN FLINT.
The Right to Regulate Railway Charges. J. M. MASON.
Prehistoric Man in America. Prof. EDWARD S. MORSE.

Price, unbound, $2.50; bound in Cloth, $3.50; in half morocco, $4.00.

Sent, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Address THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, New York.

THE

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1881.

No. 299.

Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.

NEW YORK:
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY.
1881.

been beyond the bounds of a reasonable hope to have expected a peaceful result in this gauntlet of chances to which this great office would have been thus exposed. It should be enough to say to a wise people that all questions are open and dangerous that relate to the counting of the votes of Electors. They are as numerous as it is possible for the ambition, the cupidity, the fraud, and the skill of wicked men to invent.

Other questions of momentous consequence are also open and dangerous, but as they do not relate particularly to the organic system and functions of the Government, they are passed by. What the remedy should be for the evils which so abound in our Government, is left to the reflections of thoughtful men.

It may be impossible to provide by law for the performance by others of the duties and powers of the President during a temporary inability, or for determining when, and how, and under what circumstances his permanent disability vacates his office. But the Government cannot stop because a President is unable to

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1881.

THE ELEMENTS OF PURITANISM.

[George Park Fisher]

If a Connecticut or Massachusetts Puritan of the first age of New England were to revisit the places where he had once dwelt, he would be not a little amazed, and—supposing him to retain his former opinions—not in the least gratified, at the ecclesiastical changes which would first meet his eye. He would experience the same feeling of surprise and regret almost everywhere among the ancient abodes of Puritanism, in the Old World and the New. In the room of the plain meeting-house, whose architecture was conformed to no historic model, although possessed of a certain dignity and comeliness of its own, he would find his descendants, in most of the large and in not a few of the smaller towns, gathering within the walls of a Gothic structure, mediæval in its form and associations. Raising his eyes to the spire, he would be astonished at beholding a cross on its summit, restored to the place whence he had indignantly dislodged it. Entering, with a frown, within the arched door, he would find the interior illuminated with mingled colors, transmitted through stained glass, resembling that which his contemporaries broke out of the windows of Canterbury Minster and St. Paul's, in the days of the Civil War. If it were Sunday, and the hour of worship, he would not have time to soothe the feeling excited by this transformation of a Puritan conventicle, before his ears would be offended with the sound of instrumental music, and he would descry the organ, which he had excluded from the sanctuary, reinstated in its old place of honor. According to the unpublished diary of the late President Stiles, of Yale College, the first organ ever introduced into a Nonconformist congregation in England or America was placed in a Congregationalist meeting-house in Providence, in 1770. It was a wonder and a scandal unto many. One had been used before at Princeton College, but not in the Sunday services; and the misgivings occasioned there by the use of it in college

prayers had caused it, Dr. Stiles informs us, to be laid aside. A few years ago, I visited the old church at Zurich, where Zwingle preached, the edifice from which, having the same opinion on the matter of church music as the Puritans, he had, notwithstanding his fondness for the musical art, and his skill in it, expelled the organ; and there I found the organ again in its place, and was told by the sexton that it had been brought in only a fortnight before, after three centuries of exile, the way for its return having been paved by a previous use of a melodeon. The same retrogression in this particular takes place generally, though in some localities more tardily than in others. Hardly more than a score of years have passed since an organ was allowed in the First Church in New Haven—the church founded by John Davenport. Returning to our Puritan visitor to the Congregational and Presbyterian churches of the present day, we observe that his grief and astonishment would only have begun on the discovery of the mutations which have been just described. His displeasure, if he were a Massachusetts Puritan of the early day, would be excited at hearing the Scriptures read by the minister, without comment, a practice which in his time was regarded as reprehensible. And this displeasure would be aggravated on hearing the minister read, and the people or a choir sing, hymns by uninspired authors. He might, in some congregations, hear the Lord's Prayer repeated in concert, the responsive reading of the Psalms, and other liturgical exercises which he had been wont to regard with reprobation. If favored with an invitation to a wedding, he would experience a pang, if not retire in disgust, at seeing the ring placed on the bride's finger. The participation of a minister in the ceremony might itself be offensive to him, since marriage in the old Puritan colony was by the civil magistrate exclusively. So a religious service at a funeral, and especially at a grave, would strike him as a revival of a dangerous custom, a custom adapted to encourage superstition—which the Puritan community had, therefore, sternly discarded. If emotions of sorrow and condemnation would arise in his mind in view of these innovations, what would be his impressions on seeing his descendants engage in the celebration of Christmas, in the commemoration of Easter, and even in delivering and hearing Lenten lectures for their spiritual edification? We have touched on sundry departures from old usage in matters purely ecclesiastical, without referring to various amusements and social customs

which are more or less in vogue in churches and circles still nominally Puritan,—practices which our fathers put under the ban.

Let us not be misunderstood. Puritanism had many types and phases. It was sometimes moderate and sometimes extreme. It was not just the same thing in Old England as it was in New. In England there were Puritans who would not quarrel with a moderate episcopacy. A churchman like Ussher did not differ materially from a Puritan like Baxter. There was a vast number of Puritans, under James I. and the Stuarts after him, who would have continued to use the prayer-book if a few obnoxious passages had been stricken from its pages. There were political Puritans, who coöperated with theological Puritans mainly from a wish to further the cause of civil liberty against hierarchical, as well as regal, usurpation and oppression. From the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, there was a numerous body of Puritans in the Church of England. Her bishops were most of them, in principle, Puritans. In the vestment controversy, which formed the first conspicuous epoch in the conflict, prelates like Jewell would have been glad to cast off the cap and surplice. It was only the determined will of the Queen—a Lutheran in her creed, with strong ritualistic proclivities—that prevented the Church of England from becoming Puritan in its ceremonies—that is, much more closely conformed to the example of the Reformed Church on the Continent. Burleigh, Sir Nicholas Bacon, Leicester, were Puritan statesmen. Puritanism was identified with no single form of church polity. A Puritan might be a Presbyterian, or Independent, or even favorable to an episcopate with limited functions of government. He might believe in a church establishment, or oppose it. Puritanism generally was hostile to the subjection of the church to the state, and looked with no favor on the Erastian theory, that church and state are one and the same, on which Cranmer and his associates at first proceeded, and which never ceased to exert a powerful influence in shaping the Anglican polity. Yet even when Puritanism was completely dominant, under the Long Parliament, there was a steady refusal to constitute in England a general assembly, such as existed in the Church of Scotland, or to relinquish the independence and supremacy of the civil authority in the affairs of religion, as well as in the secular sphere. As to liturgical worship, Calvinists at Geneva and elsewhere on the Continent, and in the Church of Scotland, organized by Knox,

had liturgical forms. The principal festivals, especially Easter, were frequently observed by bodies of Protestants who were closely affiliated with the Puritans. Puritans were bent on restricting the power of the Crown, especially in the regulation of the rites and ceremonies of Christian people, and in the exercise of church discipline. They wanted to simplify the English hierarchy by doing away with various ecclesiastical offices having no precedent in Scripture, and by curtailing the authority of bishops. They were disposed to sweep away from the ritual "the relics of popery,"—such as the clerical apparel, and the phraseology included in prayers which was thought to countenance Roman Catholic tenets; and they were zealous for an educated ministry and for the exclusion from communion of unworthy participants. The drift of Puritanism was toward the banishment from polity and from worship of everything which could not sustain itself by a definite appeal to Scripture. The church, the Puritan felt, was emerging from a long period of corruption. It must look for its patterns of government and rite, not to the middle ages, which were ages of superstition, not even to the comparatively pure centuries following upon the apostolic era, but to the church of the apostles itself and to the Scriptures. The settlers of New England carried the tendencies inherent in their system to a farther limit than was reached by most others who had been designated by the name of Puritan. They went back to what they considered the primitive organization of Christian societies. They discarded altogether written forms of prayer. They abjured all Christian festivals, except the Lord's Day, which they rested on a revealed commandment. Observances which emanated from ecclesiastical authority in ages subsequent to the apostles, observances which symbolized dogmas not consistent with evangelical doctrine, or even thought to give countenance to a superstitious conception of the Christian ministry—an exaggeration of its function and prerogatives—they unsparingly swept away. Æsthetic and sentimental considerations went for nothing, in comparison with the demand of what they judged to be apostolic and enlightened Christianity. Saints' days, a monument of mediæval superstition, and linked to the Romish claim to a power of canonizing the departed; with them all fasts and feasts handed down in the church, but of merely human ordination; vestments suggesting to the people that their religious teacher was something more than a minister; the agency of a clergyman

in uniting persons in marriage and in the burial of the dead, which for ages had been deemed indispensable on these occasions; the attaching of a mystic sacredness to church edifices; accessories of worship which sprang out of moods of feeling, or kindled moods of feeling, not involving of necessity intelligent acts of devotion; all these institutions and practices the Puritans, in the first age of New England, abolished. They were Protestants of the Protestants. With the Bible in their hands, they undertook a rigid excision of whatever had crept into the church, or been imposed on the church by its rulers, after the canon of the New Testament had closed.

One who glances at the ecclesiastical and exterior aspects of Puritanism may judge it to be undergoing a rapid process of disintegration. Forms of church government which Puritanism established, to be sure, still subsist and flourish. But even these —in New England, at least—have materially changed since the time when a minister lost his clerical character on leaving his office in a particular congregation, and became, in all respects, a layman. Amid these changes of custom and rite, what is there, it may be asked, that abides? What are the permanent elements, which time has spared, and which will continue to live?

There is, in the first place and preëminently, the Puritan rejection of the dogma that the minister is a priest.

This denial was a part of the protest which constituted Protestantism. Luther proclaimed it in his earliest proclamations of evangelical doctrine. But Puritanism reiterated this protest in the most emphatic and practical shape. What was the doctrine of the priesthood? It was the doctrine that the clergy are recipients of a special grace,—an "indelible" grace,—by which they are constituted the indispensable almoners of heaven's gifts to the flock, the exclusive channel through which the good offered to men in the Gospel must be received—mediators, thus, between Christ and the laity. This body of priests are a close corporation; without their act and consent none can enter their ranks. Coupled with these tenets is the doctrine of the sacraments as the indispensable means of conveying grace to the individual, as operative by a mysterious, intrinsic virtue, and as rites which the priest alone is competent to administer.

The essence of the Puritan protest must be distinguished from its accidents. To give effect to their rejection of the doctrine of a priesthood, they adopted measures which some may consider to

have been, even at that time, more radical than was necessary; the significance and propriety of which, however, can be judged aright only by those who penetrate to the core of the great controversy in which they were parties, and form a just idea of its momentous character. In other words, we must not overlook the principle for which they were consciously contending. And, as to these special practices, it may be that usages which are now safe and innoxious have acquired this character by means of the Puritan protest which led to the temporary displacement of them.

Look, for example, at the subject of marriage. This had been deemed a sacrament. As such, it was valid only when sanctioned by the priest. In no other way could the grace required for securing the benefits of matrimony be procured. Marriage without the act of the priest was impossible; it was unchristian concubinage. This had been the belief of Christian Europe. It gave to the clerical corporation of the Church of Rome an absolute control over marriage in the Christian nations under its sway. This tremendous prerogative had been acknowledged to inhere in the clergy. All this the Puritan of New England repudiated in the most practical way possible. He married without the help of a minister. He went with his bride before the civil magistrate, and entered into covenant with her. Those who call to mind the conflict, in recent days, in Roman Catholic countries — as Belgium, Italy, and France — over the validity of marriage by the civil contract, will better appreciate the magnitude of that question on which the Puritans, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, were called upon to act. When the battle has been won, — when there is no longer practical danger that the indispensableness of the clergyman to give validity to a marriage will be asserted, — the reasons, such as they were, for disconnecting the marriage covenant from religious services are no longer applicable.

The objection to the use of a ring in the marriage ceremony was felt by Puritans generally, in England as well as here, even by those who had no scruples about the solemnization of the rite by a minister. The main ground of this objection was the common idea that the ring was symbolical in such a sense as to imply the sacramental character of marriage. The ring was used in espousals by the ancient Greeks and Romans, but was not used by them as a part of the marriage ceremony. In the Church it continued to be used in betrothal, as a symbol of the tie which had been formed; but in the marriage rite itself it was probably

not used until about the tenth century. The introduction of the marriage-ring was probably derived from the custom of giving the ring, with the staff, to bishops at their consecration. Whether correctly or not, the ceremony of placing the ring on the bride's finger was held, as we have said, to indicate the symbolic and sacramental nature of marriage itself. The couples of Puritan descent who go through the form of bestowing and receiving the ring, at the present day, certainly have no such dogmatic association with what they regard as a harmless and pleasing custom. But there is no ground for flinging stones at their Puritan ancestors who were in the thick of the battle with Romish theology, and who felt called upon to scrutinize the usages which had come down from times when Christianity was taught in a perverted form, and the rights of the laity were absorbed by the clerical body.

It would be easy to show how a variety of Puritan usages are thus the offshoot of a deep-seated antagonism to the sacerdotal theory of the ministry. Those who adhere to this theory, and those who play fast-and-loose with it, not distinctly knowing what they do hold, will find nothing to respect in the sturdy, unsparing protest of Puritanism. It cannot escape the student of English history that it was the Puritans who, as regards English Christianity, inflicted upon sacerdotalism a blow from which it has never recovered.

In the second place, the Puritan was the champion of the truth that Christian worship must be a "reasonable service," that is, intelligent and spiritual.

The idea lingered in the minds of men that God has a special abode in consecrated temples, which have thus a mysterious sanctity. This idea, which the Puritan saw to be contrary to the letter as well as spirit of the New Testament, he took effectual measures to dispel. He used his "meeting-house" for town-meetings, or any other lawful secular purpose.

Another phase of this conviction as to the nature of true religion led to an abhorrence of all ceremonies which either convey no clear meaning to the mind, or were thought to encourage a piety divorced from intelligent perceptions of truth and sound principles of conduct. Vague, dreamy sentiment, emotions which spring out of no truth recognized by the mind, and leave the character and actions of those who indulge in them unaltered, were odious to the Puritan. In our times, from

æsthetic impulses, there has been a tendency toward mediæval types of devotion. Puritanism was a vigorous reaction against analogous conceptions of piety.

If the Puritan sometimes laid a rough hand on "the fair humanities" of the old ritual, the motive at least may be honored. He meant that religion and religious worship should be genuine; should be a real approach of the rational creature to the Creator. When Oliver Cromwell, in 1644, was Governor of Ely, he wrote to a clergyman named Hitch to forbear from the service of choral worship in the cathedral, which he styled "unedifying and offensive." The clergyman, however, did not desist. Entering the church and finding Hitch chanting in the choir, Oliver reiterated the command, and as the clergyman still persisted, said to him, "Leave off your fooling, and come down, sir,"—an injunction which had the effect to break off the service. It appeared to Cromwell, and to many Puritans of that day, to be mere "fooling." Ceremonies which had been transmitted from less enlightened times struck them as either a substitute for spiritual worship, or as artificial, cumbersome performances, as repugnant to sincere, manly devotion, as the elaborate etiquette of Louis XIVth's court is repugnant to our idea of genuine kindness and courtesy. There was a virility in the Puritan which made him impatient of ceremonies which he felt that he had outgrown, impatient of the pageantry of worship which was an heirloom from the days when imagination shaped the usages of court and temple. This was the secret of his craving for simplicity in religious services. The Puritan was a stanch enemy of formalism; and formalism, it cannot be denied, is a besetting danger in the Christian church as under other religions. While, therefore, many of these questions relating to worship are open to debate, and while no single individual can make himself a measure of what is edifying to all others, and no more any one generation determine what is wholesome for another, the Puritan's grand assertion that religion, if it have any worth, must be intelligent and spiritual, retains a perpetual force and value.

Thirdly, the Puritan inculcation of the supreme authority of religion in every province of human life has lost none of its importance.

Others did not deny that the civil magistrate was bound by the law of God, but the Puritan thundered this truth in the magistrate's ear. The Puritans never forgot "the higher law."

James I. was not wrong in thinking that Puritanism did not comport with such prerogatives as he wanted kings to possess. This lesson his descendants practically learned. No Puritan would ever have fallen on his knees and assured that theological despot that his twaddle was uttered with the special assistance of the Holy Ghost. The temptation of Puritanism was to substitute a tyranny of the church for a tyranny of the state; but their system nourished a spirit of independence which eventually proved too strong for any spiritual authority of their own creation to withstand.

It was the idea of the supreme place that belongs to religion as the guide and motive of all conduct, that inspired Puritan views in respect to amusements. Many of the amusements which they proscribed no Christians now approve. Macaulay wittily remarks that they forbade bear-baiting, not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators. But this reason, as everybody now allows, was good and sufficient. It was a demoralizing sport. It is a disputed point whether the theater is, or is not, a legitimate instrument of culture and source of entertainment. But few sober-minded persons would now sanction that theater which the Puritans forbade. Extreme Puritanism made too little room for recreations. Its tendency was to give a too somber hue to the life of the young. In its degenerate form, Puritanism might run into that exclusive absorption in the affairs of religion which has been designated "other-worldliness." But one should not be ashamed to declare it to be the glory of Puritanism that it cut out of the programme of life everything frivolous and everything debasing, and affirmed that man's pleasures as well as grave employments must be conducive to the advancement of his intellectual and moral nature, and consonant with his destiny as an immortal being. Matthew Arnold has made much of the want of the "Hellenic" element in the Puritan ideal of man and of life. Whatever fault there was of this character sprang from the excess of a virtue. If the injunction of Christianity be right that "*whatsoever* ye do" is to be done for the glory of God, or for a religious spirit and for religious ends, the Puritans must be allowed to be distinguished among all witnesses to this fundamental truth.

Dean Mozley has called it a sufficient argument against Puritanism that it came to be laughed at. It succeeded in making itself an object of derision. But the first Christians had the

same lot. They were "mocked at." It was not the English Puritans that Lucian derided. Moreover it must be remembered that not all Puritans were ascetic. John Milton was a zealous Puritan. The extravagances and hypocrisy which Puritanism, like other religious movements, could not fail to breed were excrescences by which the system is not to be judged. The Puritan sense of the responsibility and seriousness of life will be denied only by those who attach little weight to the precepts of the New Testament.

These are signs that the long controversy of Churchman and Puritan is approaching its end. Its dimensions are becoming every day contracted.

First. One principal bone of controversy grew out of the union of church and state. What should be the power of the magistrate in the concerns of the church? With the severance of the connection of church and state, disputes of this sort are superseded. In this country, all parties unite in the conviction that the civil authority should be neutral as regards the different denominations, and that these should severally govern and sustain themselves. In England, Nonconformist and Ritualist appear disposed to join hands in securing disestablishment. It is curious to observe that a considerable portion of the former class have hardly any other objection to the Anglican Church except that it is allied to the state. Disestablishment might bring opposers within its pale.

Second. The number is comparatively small who maintain a divine right for either system of church organization. Not only Episcopalians, but Presbyterians also, and even Congregationalists, have often stoutly asserted that their peculiar method of government is the only admissible one according to the laws of the New Testament. Such pretensions have less and less support. A multitude of churchmen agree with the great lights of the English Reformation down to Hooker and including him, —not to speak of eminent Anglicans of a later day,—that episcopal government, however ancient and however beneficial, is not essential to the being of a church or to the existence of an authorized ministry. The various systems of church order show their character by their fruits, and by their fruits they will be judged. The *jure divino* claims must share the fate of the political theories that affirmed the divine right of kings or the divine right of democracy.

Third. The historical questions, anciently so much disputed between Anglican and Puritan, are less and less controverted among unbiased scholars on either side. Let me mention two works of a recent date. The "Essay on the Christian Ministry," by Professor Lightfoot, now the Bishop of Durham, and the Bampton Lectures on the "Organization of the Primitive Churches," by Mr. Hatch, another eminent scholar, contain little which candid Presbyterian or Congregationalist scholars would dispute. The removal of such inquiries from the atmosphere of partisanship to the field of true scientific and historical inquiry, brings to pass a substantial agreement among students. The origin and character of early episcopacy are pretty well ascertained, and the results of historical research dispose of extravagant assertions which have been made on both sides.

Fourth. A right apprehension of historical development in the church has contributed to an agreement in more enlightened views. The Anglican often planted himself on the church of the first three centuries. The Puritan denied any special authority in the post-apostolic church. He found, pretty early, prayers for the dead, and other unscriptural and obnoxious practices. On the other hand, the Puritan not unfrequently, tacitly if not expressly, rejected in a peremptory way whatever could not plead for itself an explicit scriptural warrant. Protestants, on both sides, are coming to perceive that, as the Spirit of God did not forsake the church at the death of the apostles, there might be a legitimate development in doctrine, in ethics, in forms and modes of worship, in polity. Rejecting the theory of Cardinal Newman and the Roman Catholics of his school, which assumes that development was of necessity normal, and bears throughout the seal of infallibility, we can still value everything in the church of the post-apostolic ages, down to the present, which is not discordant with the genius of the Gospel. We neither cut ourselves off from the past, nor make ourselves slaves to the past. Here is an advance beyond the point of view of the average Churchman and of the average Puritan of a former day, and a basis for agreement.

Fifth. As regards worship, few, if any, would now assert the unlawfulness of written forms. Few would speak slightingly of those which are collected in the Book of Common Prayer. Who can fail to discern the power of that Litany through which multitudes of devout Christians, for a thousand years past, have

poured out their supplications for deliverance? On the other hand, the time is past for persons to speak contemptuously of extemporaneous prayer—especially persons who have much knowledge of the early church. There are many who prize the Liturgy, but yet crave the liberty of offering in public worship spontaneous, unwritten supplications. And it is more and more recognized that all Christian souls are not edified by precisely the same methods of worship. To preserve and to use the rich legacy of devotion, the treasures of prayer and hymn, which have come down from the past, and, at the same time, to give unfettered expression to the aspirations and all the deep religious emotions which belong to the living present, to the hour that now is—this is the problem which thoughtful and reverent Christian men will eventually solve. In worship, as in government and discipline, order and liberty are to blend.

GEORGE P. FISHER.

THE STATE AND THE NATION.

"The unity of government, which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your independence — the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed,— it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness."— *Washington's Farewell Address.*

A LEARNED and acute gentleman has recently put forth a new edition of a large book, designed, as the preface states, to show that the authors and promoters of the late rebellion committed no crime against the laws of the United States, for the reason that their States having passed ordinances of secession, they were no longer amenable to the Constitution and laws of the United States against treason, insurrection, etc., and that now the American people "are, in form, and life, and action, an association of republics," and, as we understand him, nothing more or other.*

Another writer, justly very eminent at the bar, and very powerful in the political party that resisted the last three amendments of the Federal Constitution, and all legislative action to enforce them, has, in the May number of this REVIEW, given his views on the nature of the relation of the national and State governments, and has pointed out what he considers to have been the invasions of State rights by the national Government, and the dangers of many acts of Congress in the direction of centralization.†

* "The Republic of Republics, or American Federal Liberty." By C. P. Centz, Barrister. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1881.

† "Centralization in the Federal Government." David D. Field.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS'

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

East of the Jordan: A Record of Travel and Observation in the Countries of Moab, Gilead, and Bashan, during the years 1875–1877. By SELAH MERRILL, Archæologist of the American Exploration Society. With Illustrations and Map. 1 vol., 8vo. $4.00.

The Bible Commentary: New Testament, Vol. 3. The Epistle to the Romans, by Rev. E. H. GIFFORD; Corinthians, by Canon EVANS and Rev. JOSEPH WAITE; Galatians, by Dean HOWSON; Ephesians, by Rev. F. MEYRICK; Philippians, by Dean GWYNN; Colossians, Thessalonians, and Philemon, by the Bishop of Derry; Timothy and Titus, by Rev. H. WACE and the Bishop of London. 1 vol., 8vo. $5.00.

The Theory of Preaching; or, Lectures on Homiletics. By Professor AUSTIN PHELPS, D. D. 1 vol., 8vo. $2.50. (In Press.)

The Orthodox Theology of To-day. By NEWMAN SMYTH, author of "Old Faiths in New Light." 1 vol., 12mo. $1.25.

The Law of Love, and Love as a Law; or, Christian Ethics. By MARK HOPKINS, D. D., LL. D. *A New Edition with important additions.* 1 vol., 12mo. $1.75.

The Origin of Nations. By Professor GEORGE RAWLINSON, M. A. 1 vol., 12mo. With Maps. $1.00.

Literary Varieties. Vol. I. Work and Play. Vol. II. The Moral Uses of Dark Things. Vol. III. Building Eras in Religion. By HORACE BUSHNELL, D. D. 3 vols., 12mo. Each, $1.50.

Chips from a German Workshop. Vol. V. Later Miscellaneous Essays. By MAX MÜLLER. Crown 8vo. $2.00.

*** A new Library edition of *Chips from a German Workshop* (5 vols.) has been issued, price reduced to $2.00 per vol.

DEAN STANLEY'S WORKS.

The History of the Jewish Church. With Maps and Plans. Vol. I. From Abraham to Samuel. Crown 8vo. **$2.50.** Vol. II. From Samuel to the Captivity. Crown 8vo. $2.50. Vol. III. From the Captivity to the Christian Era. With Maps. Crown 8vo. $2.50.

Westminster Edition of the History of the Jewish Church. Handsomely printed on superfine paper, and tastefully bound. 3 vols., 8vo. (Sold in sets only.) $9.00.

The History of the Eastern Church. With an introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History. 1 vol., crown 8vo. $2.50.

Sinai and Palestine. 1 vol., crown 8vo. $2.50.

The History of the Church of Scotland. 1 vol., crown 8vo. $1.50.

The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D. D., late head master of Rugby School. 2 vols. in one. Crown 8vo. $2.50.

THE AUTHORIZED EDITION OF

Christian Institutions.—Essays on Ecclesiastical Subjects. By A. P. STANLEY, D. D., Dean of Westminster. Students' Edition. 1 vol., crown 8vo, 75 cents. Library Edition, $2.50.

*** *These books are for sale by all book-sellers, or will be sent, prepaid, upon receipt of price, by*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, Publishers,

Nos. 743 & 745 BROADWAY, NEW-YORK.

COMPOUND OXYGEN.

For the Cure of Consumption, Asthma, Bronchitis, Catarrh, Dyspepsia, Headache, Ozæna, Debility, and all Chronic and Nervous Disorders, by a Natural Process of Revitalization.

A RAPID DECLINE ARRESTED AND THE PATIENT RESTORED TO HEALTH.

The following testimonial from Mrs. Anna G. Fourqurean, of San Marcos, Texas, came to us unsolicited. No stronger evidence could possibly be given of the curative value of Compound Oxygen. It is unequivocal in its statements. The lady's husband, from whom we have had several letters, in which he spoke of the wonderful restoration to health in the case of his wife, is a well-known and influential citizen of San Marcos, and will, at any time, corroborate the statements contained in the communication we give below:

"SAN MARCOS, TEXAS, *May* 21, 1881.

"DEAR DRS. STARKEY & PALEN: I can not refrain from adding my testimonial, as to the merits of your Compound Oxygen, to the many which are being sent to you from all parts of the country. I can testify, not that your 'Treatment' benefited me, *but that it cured me.* My symptoms indicated consumption. For seven or eight years I had been troubled, more or less, with deep oppression in the chest and pains through the lungs; slight colds would make me cough and spit up blood. In the spring of 1878 a deep cold settled on my lungs; I had a dreadful cough, accompanied by daily fevers, sleepless nights, indigestion, loss of flesh and strength, mental depression, and *hæmorrhages from the lungs.* This state continued for eighteen months, notwithstanding I had the treatment of good physicians. *By this time I had lost all vitality, spent most of the time in bed, coughed continually, raising a large quantity of deep-yellow mucus,* and, after a little sleep in the latter part of the night, *I would awaken drenched with night-sweats,* and so prostrated that I could not raise myself in bed until I had taken a little brandy.

"*I began to lose hopes of life.* My husband and my neighbors thought I could not possibly live. About this time your 'Compound Oxygen Treatment' was brought to our notice. My husband immediatcly sent for it; I stopped the use of all medicines and began the 'Treatment.' I was too weak at first to take it for as long a time as two minutes; but gradually the inhalations increased in length and strength, and would leave such a delightful sense of relief to my lungs that I loved to inhale. *My fever grew lighter each day until I had none.*

"Two weeks from the beginning of the 'Treatment' I began to feel like a new person; could take walks; *found myself singing while at my work;* indeed, I scarcely recognized my own self; my flesh increased, and I felt and looked younger.

"I used the 'Treatment' four months faithfully; after that irregularly for several months, and, at the end of twelve months from the time I began it, *I had no cough, no sign of lung-disease;* in other words, I WAS WELL.

"*It is more than a year since I left off taking the Oxygen, and I have had no return of the disease.* It is almost needless to say my heart is filled with gratitude to Drs. Starkey and Palen for their wonderful remedy. My neighbors think I am one-idead on the subject, and I wish I could get my one idea into the heads of all suffering from disease. Some people are slow to believe its merits, but it seems to me its very name should serve as a 'pass-word.'

"Hoping that this may influence some one likewise afflicted to use the 'Compound Oxygen Treatment,' I remain one among its strongest advocates.

"ANNA G. FOURQUREAN."

PROMPT ACTION AND REMARKABLE IMPROVEMENT.

In November last we received a letter from the editor and proprietor of a newspaper in the State of Ohio, in which he gave us a statement of his condition, which we condense, giving the leading points in the case:

"Age 30. Four months ago I was apparently in good health. I was at that time kept awake by one of our children, who was sick, until at last I was unable to sleep at all. I then used Chloral Hydrate for five weeks every night. I finally became despondent, melancholy, and dyspeptic, and totally unable to attend to business. Lost all interest in everything. I then put myself under the care of our best physician, but was not benefited. My vitality is below par."

A Treatment was sent early in December, and its use promptly commenced and steadily used according to directions. After the lapse of a month we received the following letter:

"——, OHIO, *January* 3, 1881.

"DRS. STARKEY & PALEN—Dear Sirs: It is now nearly four weeks since I commenced the use of Compound Oxygen, and *I am happy to report that I am much better.* During the first two weeks I did not mark *any change,* but during the last week have *felt almost well again.* My sleep *is now so refreshing;* and although I get nervous and afraid I will have a bad night nearly every evening, yet *I have not failed to get to sleep since the first night I used the Oxygen.* At first I was *restless and wakeful, but now I sleep six or seven hours at a stretch.* As to my business *capacity,* I have not been in *better trim* or felt a greater interest in my work for a *year or more.* In fact, I believe I am now *where I was* a year since. I realize from that that my complaint has been *coming* on me, slowly but *surely, for a long time—possibly years;* but I am now stepping backward out of it at a very rapid rate. I could stand a slower progress, now life *is endurable,* and I can begin to see the *silver lining of my cloud,* although I am but a few days from the *black valley. I am much better! . . .*"

After a period of nearly seven weeks, another letter was received, bearing the date February 18th, and ordering a second Treatment, from which we take an extract showing that he had not only held to the gain which he had received, but was still improving:

"I am," he says, "nearly well. *I feel splendidly, and my weight is more than it has ever been, with a steady increase of two pounds per week.* I am troubled some with nervous fears, and am in dread of another attack of sleeplessness, something that is very foolish, but over which I have not yet gained the mastery. . . . *My dyspepsia has vanished.* Altogether I am much better, *and I thank the Compound Oxygen for my present health.* Do you not think it advisable to continue a while longer? I am satisfied with my progress, but want to keep on until I have neither a pain, ache, nor morbid fancy."

Our Treatise on Compound Oxygen *is sent free of charge.* It contains a history of the discovery, nature, and action of this new remedy, and a record of many of the remarkable results which have so far attended its use.

Also sent free, "*Health and Life,*" a quarterly record of cases and cures under the Compound Oxygen Treatment.

DEPOSITORY ON PACIFIC COAST.—H. E. Mathews, 606 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California, will fill orders for the Compound Oxygen Treatment on Pacific Coast.

DRS. STARKEY & PALEN,

G. R. STARKEY, A. M., M. D.
G. E. PALEN, Ph. B., M. D. 1109 & 1111 *Girard St.* (bet. Chestnut & Market), *Phila., Pa.*